UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/080,017 | 02/19/2002 | Dinesh Nair | 5150-61801 | 7742 |

35690 7590 04/20/2004

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| SUN, XIUQIN | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2863 | |

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/080,017 | NAIR ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Xiuqin Sun | 2863 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 February 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,13-29 and 31-50* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *19 February 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 13-15, 18-20, 24-28, 35, 36 and 42-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marrion et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6408429) in view of Perez et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0116666 A1), Deckert et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6137303), Yusuf et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6256199), Shaffer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5966427), Mori et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5821627) and Stumme (U.S. Pat. No. 5272438).

Marrion et al. teach a method for performing machine vision inspection of a display device (see Abstract; and col. 1, lines 31-57), the method comprising: configuring a display inspection algorithm comprising a plurality of display inspection functions operable to perform machine vision tests on the display device (col. 4, lines 37-46; col. 8, lines 12-55; and col. 9, lines 21-31); programmatically generating a test executive sequence that implements the display inspection algorithm (col. 4, lines 47-67; col. 5, lines 1-7; col. 8, lines 56-67;and col. 9, lines 1-20); and executing the test executive sequence to perform the machine vision tests on the display device (Fig. 9; col. 17, lines 1-2, lines 50-67 and col. 18, lines 1-65). The teachings of Marrion et al.

further include: said programmatically generating the test executive sequence comprises programmatically including a plurality of test executive steps for display inspection in the test executive sequence, wherein each test executive step for display inspection corresponds to a display inspection function in the display inspection algorithm (Fig. 5; col. 8, lines 7-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31); the programmatically generated test executive sequence also includes one or more test executive steps to perform initialization of one of a hardware device and the display inspection functions (col. 16, lines 10-28); said programmatically generating the test executive sequence comprises programmatically including a plurality of test executive steps for display inspection in the test executive sequence, wherein said executing the test executive sequence comprises executing the plurality of test executive steps for display inspection to perform the machine vision tests on the display device (col. 15, lines 34-51; col. 16, lines 47-54 and lines 60-67); said executing the test executive sequence further comprises: acquiring one or more images of the display device; and analyzing the one or more images (col. 1, lines 30-57; co. 6, lines 1-32 and lines 39-48); the display device comprises an LCD device (col. 1, lines 30-47); and said display device is included as a component in a product (col. 1, lines 30-47).

Marrion et al. further teach a system for performing display inspection, the system comprising: a computer system which includes a processor and a memory medium (col. 7, lines 1-15; col. 9, lines 32-38, lines 48-52; and col. 10, lines 18-26), wherein the memory medium stores: a library of display inspection functions (col. 8, lines 7-11, lines 56-67; col. 9, lines 1-6; col. 15, lines 13-24 and lines 34-51); a test

configurator which is executable to select a set of display inspection functions in response to user input (col. 8, lines 56-67 and col. 9, lines 1-31); a plurality of test executive steps, wherein each of the plurality of test executive steps is operable to perform display inspection (col. 11, lines 11-67; and col. 12, lines 10-67); an image acquisition device coupled to the computer system, wherein the image acquisition device is operable to acquire an image of a display device being inspected (col. 6, lines 1-9); wherein the test configurator is useable to programmatically generate a test executive sequence to perform an inspection of a display device, wherein the test executive sequence includes a set of test executive steps operable to invoke at least one of the selected display inspection functions (col. 4, lines 47-67; col. 5, lines 1-7; col. 8, lines 56-67; col. 9, lines 1-20, col. 17, lines 50-67 and col. 18, lines 1-65).

Marrion et al. further teach a method for inspecting a display device, wherein the display inspection algorithm includes one or more display inspection functions operable to perform one or more image processing tests on the display device; wherein said executing the test executive sequence to perform the tests on the display device includes executing one or more test executive steps in the test executive sequence to perform the one or more image processing tests on the display device (col. 1, lines 30-57; co. 6, lines 1-32, lines 39-48; col. 7, lines 16-28 and lines 44-51).

Marrion et al. further teach a method for inspecting a display device, wherein the display inspection algorithm includes one or more display inspection functions operable to perform one or more image processing tests on the display device; wherein said executing the test executive sequence to perform the tests on the display device

includes executing one or more test executive steps in the test executive sequence to perform the one or more image processing tests on the display device (col. 1, lines 30-57; co. 6, lines 1-32, lines 39-48; col. 7, lines 16-28 and lines 44-51).

The teachings of Marrion et al. further include: a memory medium configured for generating a test executive sequence for performing machine vision inspection of a display device, wherein the memory medium comprises program instructions which are executable to perform the on-demand machine vision inspection of a display device, including displaying multiple graphical user interfaces with subsequent dialog boxes for inputting user requirement and configuring each of the plurality of machine vision tests (cols. 2-3, lines 63-33, lines 40-67; col. 4, lines 47-67; col. 5, lines 1-7; col. 7, lines 10-15; col. 8, lines 56-67; col. 9, lines 1-40 and cols. 10-11, lines 48-10).

Marrion et al. do not mention explicitly that: said programmatically generating the test executive sequence comprises generating the test executive sequence without receiving user input specifying the test executive sequence; each test executive step for display inspection is configured to call one of the display inspection functions as an external code module; said programmatically generating the test executive sequence comprises programmatically including a plurality of test executive steps for display inspection in the test executive sequence, wherein the method further comprises adding one or more additional test executive steps to the test executive sequence in response to user input; said a plurality of display inspection functions are operable to perform any tests on the display device; and said test executive sequence is operable to perform the tests on the display device. Marrion et al. also do not mention explicitly that: said one or

more additional test executive steps comprises non-machine vision tests, such as: a shock test, a noise-vibration-harshness (NVH) test, an audio test, a mechanical test, a battery test, and an electrical test of the display device.

Perez et al. teach a system and method for testing a group of related products, comprising: programmatically generating a test executive sequence without receiving user input specifying the test executive sequence (Fig. 3; sections 0062 and 0066); said programmatically generating the test executive sequence comprises programmatically including a plurality of test executive steps for display inspection in the test executive sequence, wherein the method further comprises adding one or more additional test executive steps to the test executive sequence in response to user input (sections 0025, 0027 and 0080); a plurality of test functions operable to perform different tests on one or more units under test (UUTs), and a test executive sequence operable to perform or control a test of one or more UUTs (sections 0002-0004 and 0020); and each test executive step is configured to call one of the test functions as an external code module (0054); said display inspection algorithm includes one or more display inspection functions operable to perform one or more tests on the display device (sections 0054, 0058, 0065, 0067, 0068 and 0074); wherein said executing the test executive sequence to perform the tests on the display device includes executing one or more test executive steps in the test executive sequence to perform the one or more tests on the display device (sections 0054, 0058, 0065, 0067, 0068 and 0074).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teachings of Perez et al. in the system of Marrion et

al. in order to provide an integrated generic test executive software that allows to programmatically create, configure, and/or control test sequence execution for various test applications (Perez et al., section 0004).

Deckert et al. teach an integrated overall method and apparatus for performing a series of testing and inspection of electronic products including both machine-vision tests and non-machine vision tests (col. 2, lines 56-67; col. 3, lines 1-49; col. 4, lines 17-47 and lines 55-67; col. 5, lines 1-11, lines 17-29 and lines 55-67; col. 6, lines 1-7 and col. 8, lines 12-58).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teachings of Deckert et al. in the combination of Marrion et al. and Perez et al. in order to provide a computer based integrated overall system that allows to programmatically create, configure, and/or control test sequence execution for various independent testing procedures including both machine-vision tests and non-machine vision tests (Perez et al., section 0004; Deckert et al., col. 1, lines 13-67 and col. 2, lines 1-10 and lines 30-42).

Yusuf et al. teach a technique for performing a shock test and a noise-vibration-harshness test of an electronic device (col. 5, lines 9-23).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Yusuf et al. in the combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al. and Deckert et al. in order to provide a generic test executive software that is capable of testing the physical stress, thermal stress and vibration characteristics of an unit under test (UUT) (Yusuf et al., col. 5, lines 9-23).

Shaffer et al. teach a technique for performing an audio test on an electronic device (col. 8, lines 1-18).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Shaffer et al. in the combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al. and Deckert et al. in order to provide a generic test executive software that is capable of testing the audio performance characteristics of an UUT (Shaffer et al., col. 2, lines 44-67).

Mori et al. suggest to perform a mechanical test and a electrical test on a display device (col. 2, lines 8-31; col.5, lines 26-36 and col. 30, lines 14-27).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Mori et al. in the combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al. and Deckert et al. in order to provide a generic test executive software that is capable of testing the mechanical and electrical characteristics of a display device (Mori et al., col. 29, lines 15-39).

Stumme teaches a technique for performing battery test on an electronic device (col. 3, lines 32-59).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Stumme in the combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al. and Deckert et al. in order to provide a generic test executive software that is capable of checking the battery source performance condition within an electronic device (Stumme, abstract).

3. Claims 3, 8-10, 21-23 and 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marrion et al. in view of Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Masuda et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0122582 A1).

The combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme teaches a system and method that includes the subject matter discussed above except: displaying an image on a display, wherein the image corresponds to a display device; displaying a graphical user interface of a display inspection test configurator, wherein the graphical user interface of the display inspection test configurator enables a user to interactively specify the display inspection algorithm, and receiving user input specifying the display inspection algorithm to the graphical user interface of the display inspection test configurator, wherein the user input specifies the plurality of display inspection functions; configuring one or more of the display inspection functions in the display inspection algorithm, wherein, for each display inspection function, configuring the display inspection function comprises: displaying a specialized graphical user interface for configuring the display inspection function; and receiving user input to the graphical user interface to customize operation of the display inspection function; wherein the graphical user interface enables the user to specify one or more parameters of the display inspection function, and wherein said configuring one or more of the display inspection functions comprises configuring the display inspection functions without specifying program code.

Masuda et al. disclose a programming apparatus of a visual inspection program, and teach the steps and means of displaying an image on a display, wherein the image corresponds to the product to be inspected; displaying a graphical user interface of a product inspection test configurator, wherein the graphical user interface of the product inspection test configurator enables a user to interactively specify the product inspection algorithm, and receiving user input specifying the product inspection algorithm to the graphical user interface of the product inspection test configurator, wherein the user input specifies the plurality of product inspection functions (sections 0009, 0042 and 0061); configuring one or more of the product inspection functions in the product inspection algorithm, wherein, for each product inspection function, configuring the product inspection function comprises: displaying a specialized graphical user interface for configuring the product inspection function; and receiving user input to the graphical user interface to customize operation of the product inspection function, wherein the graphical user interface enables the user to specify one or more parameters of the product inspection function, and wherein said configuring one or more of the product inspection functions comprises configuring the product inspection functions without specifying program code (Figs. 4, 5, 11A-B; sections 0009, 0042, 0051, 0052, and 0061).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Masuda et al. in the combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme in order to provide the user with a visual guidance of input operation for

configuring said test executive sequence for said inspection application (Masuda et al., section 0042).

4. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marrion et al. in view of Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme, as applied to claim 1 above.

The combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme teaches a method that includes the subject matter discussed above except: the display device comprises an OLED device.

It is however obvious that Marrion's definition of a display device (col. 1, lines 30-47) is broad enough to include a display such as an OLED (organic light emitting diode). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the Marrion method and system to an OLED device in order to perform a machine vision inspection on said OLED device.

5. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marrion et al. in view of Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Downen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6177955).

The combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme teaches a method that includes the subject matter discussed above except: the display device comprises a flat panel display device.

Downen et al. teach a visual display inspection system, wherein the display device comprises a flat panel display device (col. 1, lines 12-24; col. 2, lines 55-67 and col. 3, lines 1-2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Downen et al. in the combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme in order to provide a method for performing machine vision inspection on a flat panel display device (Downen et al., col. 1, lines 12-24).

6. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marrion et al. in view of Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Campbell et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6212496).

The combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme teaches a method that includes the subject matter discussed above except: said display inspection algorithm includes one or more display inspection functions operable to perform one or more audio tests on the display device; wherein said executing the test executive sequence to perform the tests on the display device includes executing one or more test executive steps in the test executive sequence to perform the one or more audio tests on the display device

Campbell et al. teach a method and system for performing an audio test on a digital telephone (see Abstract, Figs. 2 and 3; col. 3, lines 51-67 and col. 4, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Campbell et al. in the combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme in order to provide a method for performing controlled inspection on a display device that includes a audio component (Campbell et al., abstract).

7. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marrion et al. in view of Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Konuma (U.S. Pat. No. 5798814).

The combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme teaches a method that includes the subject matter discussed above except: said display inspection algorithm includes one or more display inspection functions operable to perform one or more shock tests on the display device; wherein said executing the test executive sequence to perform the tests on the display device includes executing one or more test executive steps in the test executive sequence to perform the one or more shock tests on the display device.

Konuma teaches a technique for performing a shock test on a LCD (col. 6, lines 10-27).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Konuma in the combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme in

order to provide a method for performing a inspection on a display device, including a thermal shock inspection (Konuma, col. 6, lines 10-27).

8. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme, as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Hsieh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4963824).

The combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme teaches a method that includes the subject matter discussed above except: said display inspection algorithm includes one or more display inspection functions operable to perform one or more mechanical tests on the display device; wherein said executing the test executive sequence to perform the tests on the display device includes executing one or more test executive steps in the test executive sequence to perform the one or more mechanical tests on the display device.

Hsieh et al. teach a technique for performing a mechanical test of an electronic circuit board (abstract and col. 2, lines 11-27).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Hsieh et al. in the combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme in order to provide a method for performing a inspection on a display device, including a mechanical testing of the components mounted on the display device (Hsieh et al., abstract).

9. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme, as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Bush (U.S. Pat. No. 4756017).

The combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme teaches a method that includes the subject matter discussed above except: said display inspection algorithm includes one or more display inspection functions operable to perform one or more battery tests on the display device; wherein said executing the test executive sequence to perform the tests on the display device includes executing one or more test executive steps in the test executive sequence to perform the one or more battery tests on the display device.

Bush teaches a technique for performing a battery test of a LED (abstract and col. 5, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Bush in the combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme in order to provide a method for performing a inspection on a display device, including testing the battery used by the display device (Bush, abstract).

10. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme, as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Park (U.S. Pat. No. 6353466).

The combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme teaches a method that includes the subject matter

discussed above except: said display inspection algorithm includes one or more display inspection functions operable to perform one or more electrical tests on the display device; wherein said executing the test executive sequence to perform the tests on the display device includes executing one or more test executive steps in the test executive sequence to perform the one or more electrical tests on the display device.

Park teaches a technique for performing an electrical test of a LED (col. 1, lines 38-67 and col. 2, lines 1-12).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Park in the combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme in order to provide a method for performing a inspection on a LCD display device, including a electrical testing of the LCD (Park, col. 1, lines 38-67).

11. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marrion et al. in view of Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme, as applied to claim 44 above, and further in view of Downen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6177955).

The combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme teaches a method that includes the subject matter discussed above except: the display device comprises an OLED device; and a flat panel display device.

It is obvious that Marrion's definition of a display device (col. 1, lines 30-47) is broad enough to include a display such as an OLED (organic light emitting diode). It

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the Marrion method and system to an OLED device in order to perform a machine vision inspection on said OLED device.

Downen et al. teach a visual display inspection system, wherein the display device comprises a flat panel display device (col. 1, lines 12-24; col. 2, lines 55-67 and col. 3, lines 1-2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Downen et al. in the combination of Marrion et al., Perez et al., Deckert et al., Yusuf et al., Shaffer et al., Mori et al. and Stumme in order to provide a method for performing machine vision inspection on a flat panel display device (Downen et al., col. 1, lines 12-24).

### *Response to Arguments*

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10, 13-29 and 31-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claims 1-10, 13-29 and 31-43 are rejected as new art references (U.S. Pat. No. 6137303 to Deckert et al.) has been found to teach and suggest an integrated overall method, apparatus and sequence for performing a plurality of testing and inspection on electronic products including both machine-vision tests and non-machine vision tests. More detailed response is given in section 2 set forth above in this Office Action.

### *Prior Art Citations*

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1) Akasheh (U. S. Pat. No. 6134674) is directed to a method and an apparatus for a computer based test operating system.

***Contact Information***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xiuqin Sun whose telephone number is (571)272-2280. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on (571)272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Xiuqin Sun
Examiner
Art Unit 2863

John Barlow
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

X.S

April 13, 2004